

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030588US1
Serial No. 10/674,974
Response to Office Action mailed March 30, 2006

II. REMARKS

1. Claim Rejection – 35 USC § 112

The examiner rejected claims 1, 10, 20, and 29 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement because the claims recited determining whether the database and the hashtable are identical” and because there was insufficient antecedent basis for “the hashtable.” Claims 2-9, 11-19, 21-28, and 30-38 were rejected for incorporating the deficiencies of claims 1, 10, 20, and 29. Applicant submits that the amendments have resolved the 112 rejections.

4. Claim Rejections 35 USC § 103


The examiner rejected claims 1-29 as being unpatentable over Ng et al. United States Patent 6,609,133 in view of Srivastava et al. United States Patent Application 2002/0120685. The examiner stated that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because the teaching of Srivastava would have provided Ng’s system with ensuring system integrity, that Srivastava’s teaching ensures proper operation, and the XML of Srivastava would have given Ng’s system the features to create, test and validate submitted data.

Ng’s invention does not perform the function claimed by applicant. Rather Ng discloses a method that allows a programmer or database administrator to isolate changes and to incorporate the changes into an existing object model and to generate new source code. (4:36-45). Applicant’s invention, on the other hand, involves an XML Schema, defined as “a computer file containing a plurality of rules for validating data.” [0034]. Srivastava does not disclose changing the rules for validating data, but rather a Service Definition and Service Descriptor that happen to

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030588US1
Serial No. 10/674,974
Response to Office Action mailed March 30, 2006

be XML documents. [0068, 0080] These XML documents are related to converting databases into information services accessible to programs. [0018] In other words, neither Ng or Srivastava, nor Ng and Srivastava together disclose an automated system for updating the rules for validating data when a change is detected.

Respectfully submitted,


Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Registration No. 37,720
Gordon & Rees LLP
Suite 2600
2100 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75201
214-461-4050
214-461-4053 (fax)
rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com